

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENWOOD DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) **CASE NO. _____**
)
)
DEVINDER SINGH DHANOA,)
a/k/a SUKHVINDER SINGH,)
a/k/a VORA JAYENDRA AMRITLAL,)
a/k/a DALIP KUMAR,)
)
Defendant.)

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S DISCLOSURES
PURSUANT TO RULE 26.01 OF THE LOCAL CIVIL RULES**

Defendant, the United States of America, responds to Local Civil Rule 26.01 (D.S.C.)

Interrogatories as follows:

- (A) State the full name, address and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of that interest.

Answer: None known to the United States at this time.

- (B) As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

Answer: Non-jury. The United States has not requested a jury.

- (C) State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly-owned company and separately identify (1) any parent corporation and any publicly-held corporation owning ten percent (10%) or more of the party's stock; (2) each publicly-owned company of which it is a parent; and (3) each publicly-owned company in which the party owns ten percent (10%) or more of the outstanding shares.

Answer: Not applicable.

- (D) State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division).

Answer: Venue is proper in the Greenwood Division because Defendant's residence is located in Newberry, South Carolina.

- (E) Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in the District, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide: (1) a short caption and the full case number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters are related; and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which may be related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases are related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the clerk of court based on a determination of whether the cases arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any other reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by difference judges.

Answer: Upon reasonable inquiry, undersigned counsel does not believe this matter is related to any other matter filed in the District of South Carolina.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherri A. Lydon
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: s/Matthew J. Modica
MATTHEW J. MODICA (#10226)
Assistant United States Attorney
151 Meeting Street, Suite 200
Charleston, SC 29401-2238
(843) 266-1676 (voice)
(843) 727-4443 (facsimile)
Email:matthew.j.modica@usdoj.gov

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

WILLIAM C. PEACHEY
Director, District Court Section
Office of Immigration Litigation

TIMOTHY M. BELSAN
Deputy Chief, National Security and
Affirmative Litigation Unit
Office of Immigration Litigation

June 25, 2018

DANIELLE SCHUESSLER
MD Bar
Trial Attorney, District Court Section
Office of Immigration Litigation
Civil Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044
(202) 305-9698; (202) 305-7000 (fax)
danielle.k.schuessler@usdoj.gov

Counsel for the United States of America